

### REMARKS

The law firm of Harrington & Smith has been requested by the Assignee to assume responsibility for the further prosecution of this patent application. A revocation of the prior power of attorney and a new power of attorney, with a change of correspondence address, has been filed or will be filed. All future communications regarding this patent application should be directed to customer number 29683.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for allegedly failing to show every feature of the pending claims. The Examiner has also objected to claims 5, 13, 18, 24 and 28 for various informalities. Claims 13-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-33 are rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,487,424 to Kraft *et al.* (hereinafter "Kraft") alone or in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,392,640 to Will (hereinafter "Will"). The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejections and objections for at least the reasons that follow.

The claims have been amended to remove the subject matter that was objected to. In addition, and without expressly or impliedly admitting that the drawings do not show all claimed features, or that claims 13-33 were properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, each of the independent claims 13, 18, 24 and 28 have been amended in a similar manner to recite, in part, that the second portion of the character strip comprises "for a first symbol to be entered by a user, the plurality of groups of symbols and, for a second symbol to be entered following entry of the first symbol by the user, at least one suggested next symbol". Support for this clarifying amendment can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 11, lines 19-27, and in Figures 3 and 4. No new matter is added.

This clarifying amendment should be found to render moot the objection to the drawings under C.F.R. § 1.83(a) and the rejection of claims 13-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Turning now to the rejection of claims 1-33 under U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kraft alone, or in combination with Will, the Examiner asserts that Kraft teaches a character strip comprising three portions: a first portion comprising functional icons a second portion a second portion comprising the one or more characters as suggested next characters, and a third portion comprising a plurality of other symbols, wherein one or more characters in the second portion and the plurality of other symbols in the third portion are determined and displayed based on a selected functional icon in the first portion. According to the Examiner, these features of the pending claims are allegedly described in Figure 3-7, Abstract, col. 7, lines 15-57, col. 10, lines 12-34 and col. 13, line 12 to col. 13, line 38 of Kraft's disclosure. See, e.g., Office Action, dated April 28, 2010, page 6, item 5, line 9 to page 7, line 10. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Kraft's Figures 3-7 show different screen displays with specific reference numerals that identify the various portions of these displays. Further, the sections of Kraft's disclosure that are relied upon by the Examiner describe a large number of features. However, the Examiner has failed to indicate which portions of the different screen displays, or which specific sections of Kraft's disclosure, allegedly describe each of the first, second and third portions of the character strip that is recited in the pending claims. In fact, the Examiner has referenced the exact same sections of Kraft's disclosure (i.e., the different screen shots in Figures 3-7 and a multitude of features in Abstract, col. 7, lines 15-57, col. 10, lines 12-34 and col. 13, line 12 to col. 13, line 38 of Kraft's disclosure) to identically reject each of the first, second and third portions of the character strip that is recited in the pending claims. Based on the contents of the present Office Action, Applicant is unable to ascertain which specific features of Kraft's disclosure are allegedly describing each of the first, second and third portions of the character strip.

In any event, it is submitted that Kraft does not in fact describe a character strip with three portions that are specifically recited in the pending claims. In particular, none of the screen displays in Figures 3-7 depict a first portion comprising functional icons (along with a second

and a third portion containing the specific features) as recited in the pending claims. For example, Figure 4 shows a main screen (i.e., equivalent to section labeled with reference numeral 20 in Fig. 3) and only a single screen region (containing the cursor 23) that contains "information candidates listed in a list containing all allowable signs and characters and even some special functions" (col. 6, lines 18-21). Note that Kraft states in col. 6, lines 30-33:

"Above the first display part 20 there is provided a headline which is a combined icon area including icons 24 and an operation mode indication area including a label 25, informing the user about the kind of text to be entered."

Clearly, Kraft does not expressly disclose or suggest, e.g., as in claim 1:

displaying a character strip on a display screen of the electronic device, the character strip comprising three portions:  
a first portion comprising functional icons,  
a second portion comprising the one or more characters as suggested next characters, and  
a third portion comprising a plurality of other symbols, wherein the one or more characters in the second portion and the plurality of other symbols in the third portion are determined and displayed based on a selected functional icon in the first portion;

or as in, e.g., claim 13 (as clarified by amendment):

scrolling through a plurality of groups of symbols on a character strip, the symbols comprising characters grouped as on an ITU-T keypad, so as to indicate one of the groups, the character strip comprising three portions:  
a first portion comprising functional icons,  
a second portion comprising, for a first symbol to be entered by a user, the plurality of groups of symbols and, for a second symbol to be entered following entry of the first symbol by the user, at least one suggested next symbol, and  
a third portion comprising a plurality of other groups and symbols, wherein the plurality of the groups in the second portion and the plurality of other groups and symbols in the third portion are determined and displayed based on a selected functional icon in the first portion.

Kraft's disclosure not only fails to teach or suggest at least a first portion of a character strip that comprises functional icons, it also fails to teach or even suggest functional icons based on which the characters and symbols in other portions of the character strip are determined and displayed. The Examiner asserts that Kraft describes changing the language dependent predictive text and symbols (see the Office Action, dated April 28, 2010, at page 6, lines 21-22). However, Kraft's disclosure fails to describe or suggest changing the language dependency using functional icons that are located on a first portion of a character strip, as is recited in the pending claims. Further, neither of the screen displays in Figures 3-7 of Kraft depict any functional icons as part of a character strip.

Therefore, Kraft fails to teach or suggest all the feature of pending claims 1, 7, 13, 18, 24 and 28. Further with regard to claims 13-33, Kraft fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Kraft.

Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and claims 1, 7, 13, 18, 24 and 28 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

As to claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-17, 19-23, 25-27 and 29-33, these claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of allowable claims 1, 7, 13, 18, 24 or 28 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when these claims are considered as a whole.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejections of the claims and to allow all of the pending claims 1-33 as now presented for examination. An early notification of the allowability of claims 1-33 is earnestly solicited.

S.N.: 10/584,012  
Art Unit: 2629

Respectfully submitted:



Harry F. Smith

Reg. No.: 32,493

9/7/2010  
Date

Customer No.: 29683

Harrington and Smith, Attorneys At Law, LLC  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400 ext. 15

Facsimile: (203)944-0245

email: hsmith@hspatent.com

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

9/24/2010

Date

Claire F. Brian

Name of Person Making Deposit